

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address Commissioner of PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
washington, Dec. 2017.
www.nepto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03.11.2003

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/834,722	04/16/2001	Mike Farwick	P 280112 000551 B1	3966	
909	7590 03 11 2003				
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP			EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 105 MCLEAN, VA			FRONDA, CHRISTIAN L		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1652		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

09/834,722

Farwick et al.

Examiner

Christian L. Fronda

Art Unit 1652



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover	sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
Period	for Reply				
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE	3	MONTH(S) FROM	
	sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 136 (a). In	no event, howeve	er, may a rep	ply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the	
- If the - If NO - Failure - Any re	g date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply as to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1 704(b)	and will expire SIX he application to b	(6) MONTH secome ABA	lS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C§ 133)	
Status					
1) 🛄	Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b) X This act	tion is non-fi	nal.		
3) 🗔	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex pa</i>	•		·	
	tion of Claims				
4) X	Claim(s) 1-7, 9, and 17			is/are pending in the application.	
•	4a) Of the above, claim(s)			is/are withdrawn from consideration	١.
5) 🗌	Claim(s)			is/are allowed.	
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-7, 9, and 17</u>			is/are rejected.	
7)	Claim(s)			is/are objected to.	
8)	Claims		are subje	ect to restriction and/or election requiremen	it.
Applica	ation Papers				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10) 💢	The drawing(s) filed onApr 16, 2001 is/are	e a) 💢 acce	pted or	b) objected to by the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	lrawing(s) be	held in a	beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on		is: a) 🗔	approved b) disapproved by the Exami	ner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply				
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	iner.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13) X	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under	35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a))	K. All b) Some* c) None of:				
	1. X. Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been rece	ived.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been rece	ived in A	application No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority dapplication from the International Bure				
*S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th	e certified c	opies not	t received.	
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority und	er 35 U.	S.C. § 119(e).	
a)	The translation of the foreign language provisional	al application	has bee	en received.	
15)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority und	er 35 U.	S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.	
Attachm	•				
	otice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		f Informal Pa	stent Application (PTO-152)	
3) In	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	6) Other			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicants' election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-7 and 9, in Paper No. 14 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that the number of restriction groups is excessive and that the restriction requirement is not correct. This is not found persuasive because a search of all the inventions in the patent literature and the non-patent literature cannot be made without serious burden because the inventions require separate searches that have different limits, boundaries, scope, and subject matter. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and of record and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their divergent subject matter and classification, restriction for examination purposes is proper.

Claims 8, 10-16, 18, and 19 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Applicants request to cancel non-elected claims 8, 10-16, 18, and 19 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 1-7, 9, and 17 are under consideration in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

- 3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention encompass any polynucleotide that is at least 70% identical to a polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide that contains the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2, a polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that is at least 70% identical to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2, and a polynucleotide containing at least 15 successive nucleotides thereof. The specification, however, only provides the following representative species encompassed by the invention: an isolated polynucleotide consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1. There is

no disclosure of any particular structure to function/activity relationship in the single disclosed species. The specification also fails to describe additional representative species of these polynucleotides by any identifying structural characteristics or properties for which no predictability of structure is apparent. Given this lack of additional representative species as encompassed by the claims, Applicants have failed to sufficiently describe the claimed invention, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms that a skilled artisan would recognize Applicants were in possession of the claimed invention. Claims 2-7 which depend from claim 1 are also rejected because they do not correct the defect of claim 1.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an isolated polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 or an isolated polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1; does not reasonably provide enablement for any other embodiment.

Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required, are summarized In re Wands [858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ 2nd 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988)]. The Wands factors are: (a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (c) the presence or absence of working example, (d) the nature of the invention, (e) the state of the prior art, (f) the relative skill of those in the art, (g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (h) the breadth of the claim.

The nature and breadth of the claims encompass any polynucleotide that is at least 70% identical to a polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide that contains the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2, a polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that is at least 70% identical to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2, and a polynucleotide containing at least 15 successive nucleotides thereof

The specification provides guidance and examples for making an isolated polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO:2 or an isolated polynucleotide comprising SEQ ID NO: 1. However, the specification does not teach the specific structural/catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for protein activity/function which cannot be altered. The state of the art as exemplified by Attwood et al. (Comput. Chem. 2001, Vol. 25(4), pp. 329-39) is such that "...we do not fully understand the rules of protein folding, so we cannot predict protein structure; and we cannot invariably diagnose protein function, given knowledge only of its sequence or structure in isolation" (see Abstract and entire publication). Furthermore, Ponting (Brief. Bioinform. March 2001, Vol. 2(1), pp. 19-29) states that "...predicting function by homology is a qualitative, rather than quantitative, process and requires particular care to be taken...due attention should be paid to all available clues to function, including orthologue identification, conservation of particular residue types, and the co-occurrence of domains in proteins" (See Abstract and entire publication).

The standard for meeting the enablement requirement is whether one of skill in the art

can make the invention without undue experimentation. The amount of experimentation to make the claimed polynucleotide is enormous and entails selecting specific nucleotides to change (deletion, insertion, substitution, or combinations thereof) in a polynucleotide to make a polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that contains an amino acid sequence that is at least 70% identical to SEQ ID NO: 2 and determining by assays whether the polypeptide has activity. The specification does not provide guidance with respect to the specific structural/catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for enzyme structure and activity/function which must be preserved. Thus, searching for the specific nucleotides to change (deletion, insertion, substitution, or combinations thereof) in a polynucleotide to make a polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that contains an amino acid sequence that is at least 70% identical to SEQ ID NO: 2 is well outside the realm of routine experimentation and predictability in the art of success in determining whether the resulting polypeptide has activity is extremely low since no information is provided by the specification regarding the specific catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for enzyme structure and activity/function which must be preserved.

The Examiner finds that one skilled in the art would require additional guidance, such as information regarding the specific catalytic amino acids and the structural motifs essential for activity/function which must be preserved. Without such a guidance, the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is undue. Claims 2-7 which depend from claim 1 are also rejected because they do not correct the defect of claim 1.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The invention appears to employ a novel gene and vector. Since the vector is essential to the claimed invention, it must be obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification or otherwise be readily available to the public. The claimed plasmids' sequences are not fully disclosed, nor have all the sequences required for their construction been shown to be biblically known and freely available. The enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, may be satisfied by deposit of the plasmid or transformed E. coli. The specification does not disclose a repeatable process to obtain the vectors and it is not apparent if the DNA sequences are readily available to the public. Accordingly, it is deemed that a deposit of the plasmid should have been made in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.801-1.809.

It is noted that the applicant has deposited the transformed E. coli strain DSM 14080, but there is no indication in the specification as to public availability. If the deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by the applicant, or a statement by an attorney of record over his/her signature and registration number, stating that the specific microorganism has been deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that the strain will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of the

patent, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.801-1.809 and MPEP 2402-2411.05, the applicant may provide assurance or compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his/her signature and registration number, showing that:

- (1) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (2) all restriction upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (3) the deposit will be maintained in a public repository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer; and
- (4) the deposit will be replaced if it should ever become inviable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

- 7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 8. Claims 1-7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 the phrase "identical to the extent of at least 70% to a polynucleotide which codes for a polypeptide which comprises the amino acid sequence of" SEQ ID NO: 2" is vague and indefinite because the specific nucleotide sequence to which the claimed polynucleotide has 70% identity to is not known and not defined in the specification. Furthermore, the phrase "the polypeptide preferably having the activity of O-succinylbenzoic acid CoA ligase" renders the claim vague and indefinite because it is not known if the claimed polypeptide has the recited activity. Claims 2-7 and 17 which depend from claim 1 is also rejected because they do not correct the defect of claim 1.

In claim 2 the phrase "preferably recombinant" renders the claim vague and indefinite because it is not known if the claim polynucleotide is or is not further limited to a recombinant polynucleotide.

In claim 5 ii), the phrase "within the region of degeneration of the genetic code" renders the claim vague and indefinite because the meaning of the phrase is not known and not defined in the specification. In part (iii), the hybridization conditions are not recited and not known and thus render the claim vague and indefinite. In part (iv) the phrase "functionally neutral sense

Application/Control Number: 09/834,722 Page 6

Art Unit: 1652

mutations" is vague and indefinite because the meaning of the phrase is not known and not defined in the specification.

Claim 6 is vague and indefinite because the specific temperature for the hybridization is not recited in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Du (Accession AD000004).

Du (Accession AD000004) teach a polynucleotide that contains at least 15 successive nucleotides encoding SEQ ID NO: 2 (see attached alignment). Thus, the reference teachings anticipate the claimed invention.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith (Accession U15187).

Smith (Accession U15187) teach a polynucleotide that is expected to hybridize to SEQ ID NO: 1 since no stringent hybridization conditions have been recited (see attached alignment). Thus, the reference teachings anticipate the of claimed invention.

Conclusion

- 12. No claim is allowed.
- 13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian L. Fronda whose telephone number is (703)305-1252. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathapura Achutamurthy, can be reached at (703)308-3804. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0196. ACK

CLF